Preached in the Cathedrall Church of York,

against Popish Transubstantiation,

and their Communion under one kinde, the first Sunday in Lent,

Anno Dom. 1622.

By Thomas Douton, Master of Arts.

LONDON, 1625.

Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye in the waies, and see, and aske for the old waies, which is the good way, and walke therein, and ye shall finde rest for your soules: but they said, We will not walke therein.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

Imprinted at London by H. L. for Mathew Lownes,
and are to be sould at his Shoppe in Paules
Churchyard, at the signe of the
Bishoppes head. 1608.

TO THE REVEREND AND VVORſhipfull Gentlewoman, Miſtreſſe CATHERINE FOVVBERIE Widdowe, his verie louing Mother in Law, health and true happineſſe in this life, and in the life to come, through Ieſus Chriſt.

BEfore I could be reſolued (Right Chriſtian, and moſt deare Mother) to handle this Text, I was driuen into a doubtfull meditation, by reaſon of a double conſideration. For conſidering that I was to ſpeake before great men, in a great Auditorie: I doubted, whether it ſhould bee more expedient, to teach from this Text non-communicants to forſake their former errours, and to renounce their ſuperſtitious vanities; or to inuite from another Text all in generall to a Lents Potation. Whereof thus muſing and meditating, I became in the end reſolued, to make choice of this Text rather, not onely in regard that the feaſt of Eaſter draweth neere: but in reſpect eſpecially, that ſome euen ex

meis intimis, otherwise vertuously inclined, are not rightly resolued how to eate the Lords Bread at the Lords Table, and to drink of his Cup. Concerning whose wilfull blindnes, and blind wilfulnes, sparing to speake I sigh to see, and rew to knowe, what I fully knowe: onely I protest before God, calling in this Sermon both the holie Scriptures, and holy Fathers to witnesse, that either there is no truth, or else that the points of Poperie (which non-communicants, like halting hypocrites, now embrace) are most false. Which rude Sermon and simple, but such as it is, vpon the assurance of your knowne courtesie, and to the end especially that a scantling heereby of that religion, which once (O happie conuersiō!) you professed, may be taken; I now offer in way of thankefulnesse for vndeserued kindnesses, and in token of great gratitude due vnto your Worship. Accept therefore (right vertuous & euer kind Mother) I humbly beseech you this poore present, and present exercise, as a poore sparke of great good will: wherein if any good thing be found, giue God (I pray you) the glorie; if any fault, impute it vnto me: and pray vnto God, that either I neuer speake, or else speake to his glorie. Thus beseeching the God of all grace, the Author, and giuer of all good gifts, to grant vnto your Worship increase of spirituall graces, and continuance of bodily health, with wealth and welfare in this life present and in the life to come euerlasting blessednesse; I leaue you, and your meditation vpon this Sermon, to the guidance & gratious assistance of the Almightie: whom I beseech so to blesse you in reading, as that being throughly resolued, how to receiue Christs holy Mysteries, you may stedfastly stand in the right profession of Christian religion,

ligion, and euer wish the prosperitie of them that loue it, and labour for it: which the Lord in mercie grant vnto euerie Christian subiect. Goodmaudam *in* Yorkeshire, *this last of March,* 1608.

By him that is vnworthie of your
motherly fauour, yet deuoted
to honour you,

Thomas Dodson.

To the Reader.

CHriſtian Reader, I haue here ſet down (ſo neere as I could remember) whatſoeuer was ſpoken in deliuering this Sermon: yea, and more matter then the time ſuffered; but not more then was purpoſed to bee vttered. For being graced beyond expectation with the gratious preſence of the moſt reuerend Father in God the Lord Archb. of *Yorke* his Grace, after his paines taken according to godlineſſe elſewhere in the Citie; I was in regard thereof rather contented abruptly to end, then to be troubleſome: whereupon partly, but eſpecially to profit ſuch abroad as hauing eares to heare, and ſoules to ſaue, do want inſtruction, I became reſolued to penne this my then exerciſe, and to put it into print. Now iudge not raſhly (gentle Reader) I moſt heartily deſire thee, in that I being the vnworthieſt of many hundreths, and the vnableſt of

many

many thousands, haue taken vpon me to set forth, and to publish any thing, to the open light and sight of the world: for wee knowe, that the poore Widdowes mite (where God is made Vmpire) shall not bee refused. And the Lord the searcher of the harts and reines, knoweth my purpose and affection in preaching and publishing this matter: wherein, if any thing be amisse (my amisse once discouered by the pen of the learned) *Peccaui* shal be my Plea: for *hæreticũ me esse nolo.* Thus I leaue thee, committing this my simple labour vnto the blessing of Gods holy spirit: who grant vs a right vnderstanding heart, with a charitable friendly Iudgement in all things.

T. D.

MATH. 26. 26, 27.

Iesus tooke the bread, and when hee had blessed, hee brake it, and gaue it to the Disciples, and said, Take, eate, this is my Bodie. Also hee tooke the Cuppe, and when he had giuen thankes, hee gaue it to them, saying, Drinke ye all of it, &c.

IT is not mine intent (most Reuerend Father, Right Honourable, Right Worshipfull, and in the Lord beloued) to speake any thing at this time cõcerning the Author of this Sacrament of the Bodie & Bloud of Christ, concerning the time when it was ordained, concerning the ende why it was ordained, or concerning any other circumstãces hereunto belonging; but onely so farre forth, as the controuersie betweene vs and the Papistes shall leade mee. Which controuersie and dissention may not bee passed ouer without dili-

gent examination, and due consideration, considering that our aduersaries in their grosse and absurd opinion, rent with their teeth him that made them, and so dishonour him, whome they ought to honour. Now, all the reason that they build vpon, is but the wordes onely of the Institution. Christ saide, *This is my bodie: Ergo* say they, it is his Bodie. Whereunto I might answere, that by like argument they may proone as well that Christ is a Doore; because hee sayth *I am that doore:* or that hee is a naturall Vine; because hee sayth, *I am that true Vine.* But aunswering I do saie with Saint *Hierome*, *That the Gospell standeth not in the bare wordes of the Scriptures, but in the meaning.* As also aunswering, I do say with Saint *Augustine*, *that there is nothing spoken obscurely in one place of Scripture, which is not made plaine and verie cleare in some other:* And that therefore wee may not (like men factious rather then religious) bring our owne senses to the reading of the Scriptures; but wee are to take the sense that the Scripture giueth, by conferring one Scripture with another: for otherwise, to take a figuratiue speech properly and according to the letter, destroyeth the soule. Saint *Augustine* in his Booke *De doctrina Christiana*, giueth diuerse learned Lessons, whereby to knowe a figuratiue speech; one of which lessons is this: *If the Scripture seemeth to cõmand a wicked thing & vngodly, or to forbid a thing that charitie requireth, then knowe* (sayth hee) *that the speach is figuratiue.* According to which rule, and direction, Christ his wordes in the Institution of this Sacrament are to bee vnderstood

Iohn. 10, 9. & 15, 1.

figu-

figuratiuely: for, Christ commaunding at his last Supper to eate his Bodie and to drinke his Bloude, seemed to commaund in sound of wordes an inconuenience and a wicked thing. Yea, to say that the breade is Christes Bodie in proper speach and according to the letter, is horrible blasphemie: for if bread in proper speach bee the flesh of Christ, then bread is also the seed of *Dauid*: then bread was fastened to the Crosse for our sinnes: then breade was buried, rose the thirde day from death, and now sitteth in heauen at the right hand of GOD the Father: yea, if bread be Christ, then is bread the Son of God, and second person in the sacred Trinity. Nay, no question if bread bee truely and properly Christ according to a literall and carnall construction: then (besides these monstrous impieties, which cannot be auoyded) it must needes ensue, that really wee eate Christes flesh in the sacrament with our mouthes, & actually drinke his bloud with our lippes; which is a thing hainous and horrible in Christian religion & behauiour: yea, as S. *Augustine* auoucheth, *It is more horrible to eat mans flesh thē to kil it, and to drink mans bloud thē to shed it.* But some peradnenture obiecting will say, that Christ said, *My flesh is meate indeed, and my bloud is drink indeed.* Wherunto in answering, it behoueth to make a difference betweene the bodie of Christ and the Sacrament of his body, least wee bee deceiued, and take one for another. And therefore I do say with Saint *Augustine, that the Sacrament (of Christs body) is receiued of some vnto life, and of some vnto destruction: but the thing it selfe (that is, the flesh of Christ) whereof this is a Sacrament, is*

Blush at this yee Papistes.

Ioh. 6.

Note this difference. Tra. 26. In Ioh.

receiued of all men vnto life, and of no man to deſtruction; yea, his fleſh is ſo truely meate, and his blood is ſo truely drinke, as that whoſoeuer doubteth of this wee hold him accurſed: but, for what part of man (ſoule, or body) this meat was prouided, in this ſtāds the difference betweene vs and the Papiſtes. They ſay, for the body, no leſſe then for the ſoule: wee ſay for the ſoule, and not for the body: Now to make this point plaine on our ſide, and ſo to ende this controuerſie; if their mouthes bee not farre out of taſte, I will plainely proue by teſtimonies of the holie Scriptures, as alſo of the holy ancient Fathers, that Chriſt his fleſh and bloud is ſuſtenance not for the body, but onely for the ſoule. *Doe you not knowe* (ſayth Chriſt) *that whatſoeuer thing from without entreth into a man, cānot defile him: becauſe it entreth not into his hart, but into the bellie.* Mar. 7. Whereby it appeareth euen in the iudgement of our Sauiour, that nothing can enter both the heart and the bellie: but the fleſh of Chriſt entreth into the heart: *Ergo*, not into the bellie. Saint *Paul* likewiſe ſayeth, *Meates are ordained for the bellie, and the belly for meates; but God will deſtroy both it, and them*: 1. Cor. 6. but the body of Chriſt God will not deſtroy: it is therefore no meate for the belly. To bee ſhort, that which doth either defile or ſanctifie, is not meat for the belly: for *meates do not commend vs vnto God*, 1. Cor. 8. 8. But *Chriſt with his bloud doth ſanctifie*, Heb. 13, 12. *Ergo*, Chriſt his fleſh and bloud is not meate for the belly.

Other arguments to this effect, and to ſet fourth the truth hereof, I could vſe many: but let theſe and all

all other prooſes bee voyde, if the learned auncient Fathers do not hereunto ſubſcribe, and euen conclude the verie ſame point. Saint *Chryſoſtome* ſayth, *Chriſt is the Bread, which feedeth not the bodie, but the ſoule, and filleth not the bellie, but the minde.* Chryſoſt. In Mat. 9. Ambroſe, *Hee is not bodilie, but ghoſtly meate.* Auguſtine, *It is not lawfull to deuoure Chriſt with teeth. Prepare not your Iawes, but your heartes.* Aug. de conſ. Diſt. 2. And Saint *Cyprian* ſayth, *The bodie of Chriſt is* cibus mentis, non ventris, *is meate for the minde, not for the bellie:* not for the teeth to chewe, but for the ſoule to beleeue. Cypr. de Cœna Dom. The Teſtimonie of all which good and lawfull witneſſes, is ſufficient to remoue vs from the corporall eating of Chriſts fleſh with teeth and iawes. Indeede touching the viſible part of this Sacrament, as the bread and wine, which is ſeene with eyes, felt with hands, and bruſed with teeth, of that there is no doubt, but it entereth our mouthes and reſteth in our bowels: but to ſay, that the naturall fleſh of Chriſt entereth the mouth, or paſſeth downe the throat, or lodgeth in the Stomacke, is a poſition (as you haue heard) altogether repugnant both to the holie Scriptures, and holy Fathers. But our aduerſaries the Papiſtes being willing to preſſe the truth, though they cannot oppreſſe it, will peraduenture obiect and ſay, Chriſt is Almightie and can do all things; therefore being able to turne breade into his bodie at his laſt Supper, hee did it. A poſſibili ad eſſe, non valet conſequentia. Whereunto I might replie, that GOD was able to make vs Swine, Sheepe, Oxen, Horſes, Progges, Dogges, &c. yet hee hath not done ſo: But anſwering, I do ſay, that though God

is able to do whatsoeuer he wil, yet he wil do none of those thinges that bee not in him of their owne nature. Sith then, that GOD is true of his owne nature, hee canne doe nothing, that is against his worde: not because that hee is not able to do it, but because his Power doth neuer ouertwharte and crosse his Will. Indeede hee is Almightie in working his will: but not in changing his nature; for that which hee will not, that hee doth not: and therefore to imagine what wee list, and then to father our falshoodes on Christes Almightie power, is errour, impietie, yea, insolent blasphemie. But passing ouer this Popish argument from *can* to *will*, whereupon no argument followeth: I will now plainely proue by the worde of trueth, and testimonie also of auncient Writers, that the bread in the Sacrament is not the substance, but a signe of Christes bodie: and that the nature of it remaineth (howsoeuer the popish sort iangle) after the wordes of consecration. Christ at his last Supper tooke nothing but breade, hee brake nothing but breade, hee gaue into the handes of his Disciples, to eate, nothing but breade, and (*as appeareth by my Text*) hee called nothing his body, but euen the same breade, which hee had taken, which he had broken, and which hee gaue vnto them. Now, in thus calling the breade his bodie, it was in mysterie and figure, not in nature and substance: and therefore it is but as if hee had sayde, This breade which I haue in my handes is a signe of my body which shortly after shall bee crucified, and deliuered

vnto

vnto death for your ſaluation. To which effect, after this manner thus ſpeaketh Saint *Cyprian*: *Dedit dominus noſter in menſa, in qua vltimum cum Apoſtolis participauit conuiuium, &c.* Our Lord at the Table, whereat he receiued his laſt Supper with his Diſciples, gaue with his owne hands bread and wine: but vpon the Croſſe, he gaue his own body to be wounded by the hands of the ſouldiers. Where hee maketh a difference betweene that which Chriſt gaue vpon the Croſſe, and that which hee gaue at the Table: at the Table hee gaue bread and wine; vpon the Croſſe, hee gaue his bodie and bloud. Likewiſe elſe where, hee calleth the bread after conſecration, *Panem ex multorum granorum adunatione congeſtum.* Bread made of the ſubſtance, and moulding of many cornes. Wherunto Saint *Auguſtine* ſubſcribing, thus ſpeaketh in the perſon of Chriſt: *This body which you ſee you ſhall not eate, neither ſhall you drinke the bloud which they that crucifie mee ſhall ſhedde: I haue commended a Sacrament vnto you, which ſpiritually vnderſtoode ſhall quicken you.* But to bee ſhort, Saint *Paule*, (who ſetteth foorth fully and moſt effectually both the doctrine and right vſe of the Lords Supper) is well worthie to decide this controuerſie, where diuers times in one piece of a Chapter after the wordes of conſecration hee repeates the word, Bread. In concluſion therefore it muſt needes followe and bee graunted, ſtriue the pieuiſh and peruerſe Papiſtes neuer ſo much againſt it, that the name of the thing ſignified is giuen in this place to the ſigne it ſelfe: which is a figure, not ſtraunge or newe;

Cypr. de vnctione Chriſmatis.

Aug in Pſal. 98.

1. Cor. 11.

but

but vsuall and common, where mention is made of Sacraments: for, the Lorde, speaking of *Circumcision*, calleth it the Couenant: yet circumcision is not the couenant, but a signe of the couenant. And the *Paschall Lambe* is called the Lords Passeouer, though it was not the Passeouer, but the signe of the Passeouer, & serued onely to put men in remembrance of that benefit, as it is afterward expounded: but leauing the holy scriptures, I will now proue the verie same point by the Authoritie of the holy Fathers. Saint *Augustine* in his booke of Questions vpon Leuiticus, hath these wordes: *Solet res quæ significat, eius rei nomine quam significat, nuncupari.* That is, The thing that doth signifie, is wont to bee called by the name of the thing that it doth signifie. And in the Epistle which hee wrote to *Bonifacius*: *Si enim Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum Sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent: ex hac autem similitudine, plerunque etiam ipsarum nomina accipiunt.* If the Sacraments (saith he) had not some certaine similitude of the things whereof they be Sacraments; they should be no Sacraments: and of this similitude, many times they haue the names of those thinges themselues. Whereunto *Theodoretus* agreeth, and speaking of Christ thus subscribeth: *Hee that did call his body wheate and bread, and himselfe a vine, doth honour the bread and wine with the name of his bodie, and bloud, not chaunging the Nature, but adding grace vnto the Nature.* And Saint *Chrysostome* hath the verie like wordes. Whereby it appeareth, and euen hereupon may rightly bee inferred, that the Romane transubstantiators haue no ground

Gen. 17.

Exod. 12.

Aug. super Lev. quæst. 57.

Idem ad Bonifacium. Epist. 23.

Theod. Dial. 1.

Chrysost. ad Cæsarium.

ground of reaſon, to affirme that there is more tranſubſtantiation in the Supper, by chaunge of the ſubſtance of the ſignes, into the thing ſignified by the vertue of conſecration, then in all the other Sacraments. For if there were ſuch a change of ſubſtance, by the vertue of the Sacramentall wordes, and of the conſecration of the ſignes, it ſhould neceſſarily then come to paſſe, that the ſame ſhould bee in all Sacraments, and not more in the one, then in the other; forſomuch as there is none at all that may bee Sacraments without conſecration, and without Sacramentall words, and they haue all this common together, and the like reaſon is in them all, concerning this point. But to bee ſhort, and yet for more full contentation, & euen to giue ſatisfaction to the ſimpleſt here preſent, that the ſigne is called by the name of the thing ſignified, and that there is no mutation in the ſubſtance of it, but onely in the vſe; I do for further proofe in this behalfe, appeale to the outward ſenſes: as, to the eyes, noſe, mouth, taſte, hands, and euen to the reaſon of man, what it is, that wee doe receiue, when wee come at the feaſt of Eaſter, and at other times to the Lords Table. Whereunto in anſwering if theſe ſenſes iumpe and agree, that it is bread and wine conſecrated to a holy and heauenly vſe; they verilie ſpeake the truth and lye not: for there was neuer any tranſubſtantiation and conuerſion of one ſubſtance into another, but the outwarde ſenſes iudged it to be ſo. As for example, when the rodde was turned into a Serpent, the Iſraelites ſawe it: And when water was turned into wine at a Mariage, the gueſts ſaw it, and taſted it. But now in this Sacra-

Note well.

Exod. 4.

Ioh. 2. 8.

ment we do not see any such mutation: the bread being sanctified taketh not the forme of flesh, neither doth the wine appeare to be bloud, but, as signes, do remaine all one in quantitie and qualitie, without alteration of substance. Whereby (beloued) albeit it appeareth, as also by that which formerly hath beene deliuered, that our cõstruction concerning the words of the institution, is consonant & right agreeable not onely to learning and religion, but to common sense also and reason: yet vtterly to ouerthrowe the false doctrine of popish transubstantiation, and to put it out of doubt, that we eate not Christs bodie carnally as our aduersaries dreame and grossely imagine, I wil now ouerturne by force of arguments and sufficient reasons, the turning of the bread into the Body of Christ, and the wine into his bloud, though many as concerning this point (which yeelde from other points of superstition) do sticke, and are verie hard to be perswaded.

The first reasõ against transubstantion.

That the substance of bread remaineth in the Sacrament after the wordes of consecration, I will first proue it from the definition of a Sacrament. For the Fathers do affirme it to consist of an earthlie thing, and of an heauenly thing: of the Word, and of the Element. Now for the element and earthly thing to bee taken away by transubstantiation, is against, and euen vtterly destroyeth, the verie nature of a Sacrament. And therefore from the definition thereof wee are well taught and instructed, that the bread, which is the element and earthly thing, remaineth still in substance without alteration, as well after as before the consecration; according to this saying

Auguſt.
Chryſoſt.

ing of Saint *Augustine: The word commeth to the Element*, (he sayth not taketh away the Element) *and so it is made a Sacrament.*

Againe, in Baptisme the substance of Water remaineth, though it hath wordes of consecration, and is made a Sacrament of our Regeneration: and therefore in the Lords Supper, the bread and wine are not changed and done away vtterly: for the Scripture speaketh as highly of the one as of the other. The second reason.

Againe, if the Elements of bread and wine are conuerted into the verie Bodie and Bloude of Christ: then the verie reprobates, as *Iudas*, should truely feede on the Bodie and Bloud of Christ, and so should bee saued: but this is false, and flat against the Scripture; *Ergo*, there is not any such conuersion. The third reason.

Againe, if the Papistes receiue Christs bodie in the Sacrament, then they receiue either his mortall, or his immortall body. If they say, they receiue his mortall bodie: I might answere, that it cannot profitte them; because mortall foode, is but for this mortall life: but I aunswere, that CHRIST hath not a mortall Bodie to communicate vnto them; for it is now chaunged, and hath putte on immortalitie. If they say, they receiue his immortall, and glorified Bodie, then like men slaine with their owne swordes, they must flie from this their text, *Hoc est corpus meum*; because at the time when CHRIST spake these wordes to his Disciples hee had no glorified body: for the Sacrament was instituted before his death, The fourth reason.

and his body was not glorified vntill after his resurrection.

The fift reason. Againe, if the Papistes receiue the verie same bodie of Christ in the sacrament, which he had from the Virgine *Marie*, and which was on the Crosse: thē it must haue the same naturall properties of a Body which that had, as proportion of shape, distinction of partes, extention of quantitie, circumscription of place, and the verie same substance of flesh, which he tooke of his Mother *Marie*: for these properties had Christes Body, that hung on the Crosse: but the bread (which they say, is turned into Christs Body) is without these and such like properties of mans nature: *Ergo*, the bread is not turned really and substantially into the body of Christ which came from the Virgine *Marie*, and which was offered for vs on the Crosse.

Note here a great absurditie.

The seauenth reason. Againe, the breade in the Sacrament after the wordes of consecration is subiect to as many chaunges and chances as it was before: it may putrifie, and the wine may wax sharpe and turne into vinegar; yea, both of them may be mingled with ranke poyson: but the precious Body & Bloud of Christ cānot be mingled with poyson; but is an excellent counterpoyson against all infection of sinne whatsoeuer: the Bodie of Christ cannot putrifie, the blond of Christ cannot become sharpe or sowre as the outwarde signes may: the substance therefore of bread & wine is not changed into the bodie and bloud of Christ, but remaineth still, after the wordes of consecration.

The eight reason. Againe, *Christ sitteth on the right hand of God*, (Hebrewes,

(Hebrewes, 1.) *and there ſhall remaine, touching his humanitie* (as Saint *Peter* teacheth) *vntill the time that all thinges bee reſtored which God hath ſpoken by his Prophets*, Acts, 3. *Ergo*, Chriſt is not bodily preſent in the Sacrament: for it is againſt the nature of a natural body to be in moe places then one at once. And therefore ſaid Saint *Auguſtine*: *Corpus domini in quo reſurrexit, in vno loco eſſe oportet; veritas eius vbique diffuſa eſt*: the Bodie of Chriſt in the which he roſe can be but in one place, though his trueth is diſperſed euerie where.

Againe, we are charged to do this in remembrance of Chriſt; *Do this* (ſayth hee) *in remembrance of me*, in remembrance of my benefit wrought for you, & in remembrance of your ſaluation purchaſed by me. Now, remembrance is not of things preſent, but of thinges abſent. The ninth reaſon. 1. Cor. 11.

Againe, it is recorded in the ſame Chapter, *that whenſoeuer wee eate the Lords Bread and drinke of his Cuppe, wee are ſayde but to ſhewe his death vntill hee come*: ſo that it is but a ſhewe and Repreſentation of his Death, vntill his comming. The tenth reaſon.

Laſtly (to omitte many other reaſons) wee beleeue that Chriſt ſhall come from heauen, and from no other place to iudge the quicke and the dead, and that in the ſame manner hee aſcended: but if Chriſts Bodie bee made of breade, hee ſhall ſtart out of the Pixe, and not come from heauen; yea, and that in another ſhape then when hee aſcended. Which popiſh wonder, with other their ſtrange deuiſes, ſo ſauoureth of noueltie, that vnleſſe our aduerſaries haue ſtill The eleuenth reaſon. Note this wel.

whoriſh forheades they will bluſh and be aſhamed: yea, and that the rather, in that againſt theſe and many ſuch like arguments, and diuine reaſons, they cannot alledge any one teſtimonie of Scripture to proue their tranſubſtantiation; but onely that Chriſt ſayde, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, This is my Body. Which words (as formerly appeareth) are not to bee vnderſtoode properly, but figuratiuely: not naturally, but ſignificatiuely: not carnally, but ſpiritually. Yea, beſides that which alreadie hath beene vttered, if the holy auncient Fathers, in thus expounding them, make not with vs expreſſely, and againſt our ſaid aduerſaries directly, then the victorie ſhall bee theirs, and the ſhame and ouerthrowe ours: yea, then with the foole I will fooliſhly ſay, *Non putâram*. *Tertullian*, being a holy Writer, and a verie auncient Father (for hee liued more then 1300. yeares ſince) expoundeth them thus in his fourth booke againſt the heretike *Marcion*: *Acceptum panem, & diſtributum diſcipulis, corpus ſuum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc eſt corpus meum: id eſt, figura corporis mei.*

The auncient Fathers affirme the wordes of Chriſt to be figuratiue.

Lib. 4. Contr. Marcion.

Chriſt taking the bread and diſtributing to his Diſciples, made it his Body; ſaying, This is my Body: that is to ſay, this is a figure of my Bodie.

And in his firſt booke againſt the ſame Heretike, the ſame Authour writeth after this manner: *God did not reiect bread which is his creature, for by it he hath made a repreſentation of his Bodie.*

Idem, lib. 1.

Saint *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *The bread ſanctified is counted worthie to bee called the Lords Body, etſi natura panis in ipſo permanſit*, though the nature of the bread remaine there ſtil.

Chryſoſt, ad Cæſar.

Theodore-

Theodoretus, aunſwering to the obiection of an heretike, is right plaine in this point: for ſayeth hee, *Signa myſtica poſt ſanctificationem non recedunt a natura ſua, ſed manent in priori ſubſtantia, et figura, & forma.* That is, The myſticall tokens after the ſanctification depart not from their owne nature, but remaine in their former ſubſtance, figure, and ſhape; yea, and are ſenſiblie ſeene to be the verie ſame they were before. Dialog. 2.

Saint *Hierome*, ſpeaking of Chriſt, ſayth, *He offered not water but wine, for the figure of his bloud.* Saint *Ambroſe* ſayeth, *that the bread and wine are the verie ſame they were, both in nature and ſubſtance.* Ambr. de Sacra. lib. 4. cap. 4.

And Saint *Auguſtine* hath written at large in many of his workes, and ſo plainely, againſt the error of tranſubſtantiation, that our aduerſaries the Papiſtes loue leaſt to heare of him of all other writers: partly for his authoritie, and partly becauſe hee openeth the matter more fully then any other. For ſayth hee, *Chriſtes fleſh and bloud was in the olde Teſtament promiſed by ſimilitudes and ſignes of their ſacrifices, and was exhibited indeed and in truth vpon the Croſſe: but the ſame is now celebrated by a Sacrament of remembraunce vpon the Altar.* Auguſt. Contr. Fauſtū. Likewiſe againſt the heretike *Adimantus*, he thus writeth: *Non dubitauit dominus dicere, hoc eſt corpus meum, cùm ſignum daret corporis ſui.* Our Lorde doubted not (ſayth he) to ſay, This is my body, when hee gaue a token of his Bodie. In an other place alſo, *Chriſt tooke Iudas* (ſayth hee) *vnto his Table, wherat he gaue vnto his Diſciples the figure of his body.* Contr. Adim. lib. 4. Idem in pſal. 3.

Yea,

Yea, and to this verie Sacrament hee applyeth this rule, *Omnis res naturam et veritatem illarum rerum in se continet, ex quibus conficitur*: that is, euerie thing keepeth and containeth the nature and truth of those things, of which it consisteth.

Now (most Reuerēd, & right blessed brethrē) if these & other reuerend olde Fathers, writing to like effect, haue expounded the wordes of Christ rightly, then where is the papists transubstantiation?

Surely, surely (deare Christians) how rightly and religiously they are by the Fathers expounded, it may wel be conceiued, in that not any one of the auncient writers euer spake of reall presence, or the literall sense of these words, *This is my Body*: yea, let our aduersaries the Papists bring but one Catholick and godly learned Father, for the space of 700. years after Christ, that euer taught Popish transubstantiation, or that signified and insinuated any such matter; and we will not onely thereunto subscribe, but account also al other their vaine and vncatholike fancies, to bee right Catholike doctrine. But men, brethren, and Fathers, the best learned of that frowarde generation are so far from pleading either Canonicall Scriptures, or Catholike Fathers, as that either they say directly (as did *Alphonsus* a great Papist) *that the auncient Fathers neuer knew transubstantiation*; Or else doubtfully (as did *Gabriel Biel*, another popish doctor) *that how the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament, it is not found expressed in the Canon of the Bible:* Or else they say deceitfully (like craftie huckesters) that they must hold of the Sacraments as the Church of *Rome* doth. Which third and last affirmation being fond and foo-

Vpon the Canon, lect. 40.

lish,

liſh, is vtterly to be contemned and condemned: for Tranſubſtantiation was neuer heard of at *Rome*, or in any other part of the world, vntil it was there decreed in the late councell of *Laterane*, holden vnder Pope *Innocentius* the third, in the yeare of our Lorde God 1215. So that for the ſpace of twelue hũdred & fifteen years after Chriſt, the Church of God was well able to ſtand without it. Now therfore it ſtãdeth vs in hand conſidering the newneſſe of it, and that our Sauiour Chriſt in ſaying, *This is my Bodie*, did not aboliſh the ſubſtance of bread & wine, but did vnite the force and fruit of his fleſh crucified, and bloud ſhed for our ſins, to the elements, that ſo receiuing the one, wee might through faith, and by the operation of his working ſpirit be partakers of the other; it ſtands vs (I ſay) in hand, not to bend our mindes on the outward ſignes of bread & wine ſet before vs: but rather lifting vp our hearts from them to Chriſt, who liueth & reigneth in heauen, it behoueth vs to behold him the very lambe of God ſlaine for the ſins of the world, with the eyes and hands of our faith. *Nam fide tangitur Chriſtus, fide videtur: non corpore tangitur, non oculis comprehenditur.* For faith Saint *Ambroſe*, By faith Chriſt is touched, by faith he is ſeene: hee is not touched with our bodie, nor viewed with our eyes. And elſewhere: *Non corporali tactu Chriſtum, ſed fide tangimus.* That is, we touch not Chriſt (ſayth he) with our fingers, but with our faith.

The age of the Papiſts new tranſubſtantiation is 393. yeares.

Ambr. in Luc. lib. 6.

Saint *Auguſtine* likewiſe crieth: *To what end prepareſt thou thy teeth and thy belly? beleeue, and thou haſt eaten.* And in another place, *We cannot* (ſayth he) *handle Chriſt with our fingers: but with our faith wee may.*

Auguſt. in Ioh. tract. 25.

may. Yea, that to beleeue in Christ is to eate his flesh and drinke his bloud, Christ himselfe thus proueth it:
Ioh. 6. *Hee that commeth to me shall not hunger; and he that beleeueth in me, shall neuer thirst.* By which faith accordingly, not we, vnder the Gospell onely, do eate Christs flesh and drinke his bloud; but the Patriarkes also, and Prophets, & people of God which liued before the birth of Christ, did receiue him, and eate him,
1 Cor. 10. and liue by him: *They did* (as Saint *Paule* auoucheth) *all eate the same spirituall meat*, that is to say, *euen the same Christ that we eate, and did all drinke of the same spiritual drinke.* Whosoeuer beleeued in Christ, they were nourished by him then, as we are now. They did not see Christ: he was not yet borne, he had not yet a naturall body, yet did they eate his body: he had not yet any bloud, yet did they drinke his bloud; they beleeued that it was he, in whom the promises should be fulfilled, they beleeued that hee should be that blessed seed in whom all Nations shold be blessed. Thus they beleeued, thus they receiued, and did eate his body. Wherupon, the premisses considered, it may rightly be inferred, that not our mouthes, but our minds; not our bellies, but our spirits, are nourished with the flesh & bloud of Christ: & that not by chewing, or swallowing; but by remembring and beleeuing that his body was wounded, & his bloud shed for our perfect and eternall redemption.

THus hauing hitherto declared (in handling the late doting deuise of transubstantiation; wherupon in a manner dependeth all Poperie) and euen effectually proued by sufficient testimonies both out of the

the holy Scriptures, and holy auncient Fathers, that the nature of the bread remaineth in the Sacrament after the words of consecration, and that there is no mutation in substance, but in vse: it now further resteth but onely to point at an another horrible point of popish blasphemie, and so to committe you to God.

Although (beloued) our Sauiour Christ commanded the Sacrament to bee ministred to all people in both kinds: yet our aduersaries the Papistes making euen him our Sauiour to haue no wit, nor vnderstanding what he did or said at his last supper, haue lately forbidden the mysticall Cuppe of his precious bloud to be ministred to the Laitie. Wherein how shamefully soeuer, or rather how blasphemously these iollie fellowes, like iollie iuglers do iudge this matter: yet I am sure that the holy Scripture teacheth plainely, that the books of the auncient Writers testifie plentifully, and that continual practice for the space of a thousand yeares and vpwarde firmely pleadeth, and without contradiction, the contrarie. Saint *Paul* speaking to the whole congregation, sayth: *As often, as ye shall eate this bread, and drinke this cuppe, yee shew the Lords death till hee come.* 1. Cor. 11. vers. 26. 27. 28.

And againe, *Whosoeuer* (saith he) *shal eat this bread, and drinke the cup of the Lord vnworthily, shall be guiltie of the bodie and bloud of Christ.*

And againe, *Let euerie man* (saith hee) *examine himselfe, and so let him eate of this bread and drink of this cup.* He doth not say, let the Pastor and Minister examine himselfe, & so drinke of this cup; but euery man, euen euery Christiã. To iustifie which expositiõ frõ Christ himself by a generall affirmatiue, I appeal

to the tenor of the institution. For as it was sayd, *Take yee, eate yee:* so it was said at the same time to the selfe same parties, *Drink ye all of this.* Which two precepts Eate ye, drinke ye, compriseth all, both Laymen and Clerkes: and therefore both sorts are either to bee excluded, or else to be admitted to receiue in both kinds.

Arguments against halfe Communions.

Againe, the fruit & effect of the bloud of Christ is common to the people with the Pastor: *Ergo,* being partners in the thing signified, the outward signe thereof, which is the Communion of his bloud shed for the redemption of his people, ought to be diuided indifferently betweene them.

Againe, A dead mans will may not bee changed: Nothing can be put to, nothing taken out, without forgerie and false-hood: *Ergo,* the cup of saluation being a part of Christs will, & testament, may not bee taken away from the Laitie without sacriledge & bloudy cruelty. And againe, if the water in Baptisme may not be taken away from the Lords people: then the cup of the new Testament may not be taken away frō them (for the bloud of Christ, whereby remission of sinnes is purchased, is represented by the wine of the Lords Supper, aswel as by the water in Baptisme): but the water in Baptisme may not be omitted or neglected: *Ergo,* the cup of blessing may not (without great iniury done to the Lords people) be taken from them. Other arguments to this effect, & in setting forth the truth hereof, I could vse many: but, knowing the nature of this matter to bee such, as that the euidence & clearnes of the thing it selfe speaketh for the proofe thereof, I am rather now disposed to call to witnesse in this behalfe the holy auncient Fathers.

Gal. 3. 15.

Ignatius,

Ignatius, being a good olde Christian and constant Martyr of Iesus Christ in the primitiue Church, writeth thus to the Church of *Philadelphia*: *I exhort you, that you vse al one faith, one publique Ministerie & preaching of the word, and one Eucharist: for there is but one flesh of Iesus Christ, and one bloud shed for vs; one bread broken for all, and one cup distributed to all.* Note well the consent of the Fathers. Ignat. ad Philad.

Saint *Cyprian*, writing vnto *Cornelius*, saith, *How do we teach or prouoke them for the profession of his name to shed their bloud, if to them going to the battail* (speaking of Martyrs) *wee shall denie his bloud? or how shall we make them fit for the cuppe of Martyrdome, if we admit them not first, by right of the communion, to the cup of the Lord?* Epist. 2.

Tertullian saith, *By the Sacrament of bread and of the cuppe, we haue proued in the Gospell the veritie of the bodie & of the bloud of our Lord, against the phantasticall dreames of* Marcion. Lib. 5. aduersus Marcionem.

And Saint *Chrysostome*, administring the Sacraments himselfe in the famous Citie of *Constantinople*, is so plaine in this point, that nothing can be plainer: for (saith he) *There is a thing wherein the Priest differeth nothing from the people; as when he must receiue the dreadfull Mysteries. For it is not here, as it was in the olde Law, where the Priest eate one part and the people another, neither was it lawfull for the people to be partaker of those things which the Priest was: but now it is not so, but rather one body is proposed to al & one cup.* Chrysost. in 2. ad Cor. Hom. 18.

Lastly, to the end that all men may see and perceiue what great iniurie is done to Christian people (for whom Christ died) by Pope-catholikes, the Ro-

miſh Heretikes, eſpecially that ſuch falſe Catholikes themſelues may cõfeſſe it, if not with their mouthes, at the leaſt in their conſciences; I will call at this time two Popes to witneſſe. Pope *Leo* the firſt, in whoſe dayes the communion vnder both kindes was ſo ordinarie and certaine, as that it was the marke whereby to knowe the Manachees, the moſt pernicious Heretikes that were in the Church, thus auoucheth: *They take in their vnworthie mouthes the Body of the Lord, and refuſe altogether to drinke the bloud of our Redemption*; which he calleth a ſacrilegious hypocriſie. And Pope *Gelaſius* ſpeaking not of the Manachees, as *Leo* doth, but of other perſons receiued into the Chriſtian Church, thus vttereth his iudgement; *Wee haue heard, that ſome hauing onely receiued the holie portion of the bodie, do abſtaine from the cuppe of the holie bloud: but ſith that they are mooued by a fond ſuperſtition, which I know not, thus to abſtaine, either let them receiue the whole Sacrament, or els let them be wholly and vtterly reſtrained and ſhutte out from the ſame: for there can bee no diuiſion of this one Sacrament, and highe myſterie, without great Sacriledge.* Whereby it appeareth, euen in the iudgement of theſe Popes, that if we will not incur & run into apparent, violent, and wilfull Sacriledge, the communion muſt bee miniſtred to all men, without exception, in both kindes, according to the right intention of Chriſt Ieſus, and according to that courſe which the Chriſtian world diligently obſerued for the ſpace of 1230. yeares, and euer after alſo (but euen in ſome few places onely) vntill in the late Councell of *Conſtance* a wicked decree and vngodly was made

Serm. quadrag. 4.

De conſecra. diſtinct. 2. cap.

If Popes tell you this tale take heede ye Papiſts to your conſciences.

made to the contrarie. Whereupon, *Gerſon* a great Papiſt being a chiefe agent in that Councell, with other the Popes Proctours and Doctours of ſpeciall reputation, did ſo beate their braines to iuſtifie that Acte in that Councell eſtabliſhed, as that they almoſt loſt their foreheades. For the conſiderations by them alleadged, wherewith they were ledde thus to chaunge the laſt Will and Teſtament of CHRIST IESVS, are but verie poore ſhiftes and moſt miſerable inducementes: as, the length of Laymens beardes, the coſtlineſſe of wine; the difficulties firſt of getting, then of keeping wine from ſowring, from freezing, and breedinge of flies. All which and many ſuch like fooliſh and friuolous toyes thus hatched by their owne fancies, being no leſſe ridiculous then the fact was impious, muſt ſtand for reaſon (if wee will bee ruled by a whoriſh Mother the Church of Antichriſt) againſt all reaſon and religion.

Now what is mockerie, or what is iniurie to GOD and man, if it bee religion and pietie, in reſpect of long beards, in reſpect of froſtes in winter, and flies in Summer, to correct Chriſts inſtitution, and to chaſe the Lay people from the cuppe of their ſaluation, from the Communion of Chriſts bloud, and fellowſhippe of his holy ſpirite? Surely, ſurely (beloued) howſoeuer theſe daintie Diuines haue lately thus fallen into great blindneſſe, or rather wilfull madneſſe: yet vndoubtedly no Church euer reſiſted mangled Communions with greater vehemẽcie thã the Church of *Rome* did, til couetouſnes & pride blinded her eies, & hardned her heart againſt

God

God and his sonne Christ. Which God for Christ his sake open the eyes of her corrupt Children, and so mollifie their hearts, as that they may receiue Christs holy Mysteries, not according to their owne fond fancies, & doting dreames, but according to the first institution thereof, & according to the general practice of all Christian Churches in former times. For otherwise if they still lead their dayes in voluntarie blindnesse, & wilfull wickednesse, they shall die in their sinnes, yet death and damnation shall be their portion for euer: because they haue pleasure in their owne inuentions, and do not giue their hearts to receiue, to beleeue, & to loue the truth. From which death and damnation, hee deliuer both them and vs, who to receiue the blessed Sacrament in both kindes by his last wil commanded vs, euen Iesus Christ the righteous: to whom with the Father, and the holy Ghost, three persons in Trinitie, bee trewall, eeerlasting and euerlasting God in vnitie, be rendered all power, all praise, all might, and all maiestie, both now, and for euermore.

FINIS.